

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
SAVANNAH DIVISION

NADEZHDA SPROLE,

Plaintiff,

v. 4:11-cv-231

BRYAN COUNTY SCHOOL  
DISTRICT,

Defendant.

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Nadezhda Sprole's Motion to Reconsider. *See* Doc. 26. Sprole asks the Court to set aside the judgment entered against her in this case and allow her more time to find an attorney. *See id.*

On May 3, 2012, Andrew Gorman, withdrew as attorney of record to Sprole. *See* Docs. 19; 20. Sprole states that "Gorman neglected to file with the court any motion to preserve my rights to discovery and a normal trial process." *See* Doc. 26. However, Gorman complied with the requirements of S.D. GA. L.R. 83.7 by delivering notice of his intent to withdraw to Sprole at least fourteen days prior to filing the motion to withdraw. *See* Docs. 19 at 1; 19-1 at 2; 19-2 at 2. Gorman also moved to stay the case and to extend discovery. *See* Doc. 17.

On April 26, 2012, the Court granted Sprole a thirty-day extension of all deadlines in the case. *See* Doc. 18 at 2. The Court noted that "[t]his case has been on the Court's docket since September 16, 2011 . . .

and ample discovery time has been granted. . . . Sprole shall be free to request more time if and when Gorman's contemplated withdrawal motion is granted." *Id.*

On June 25, 2012, Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. *See* Doc. 21. The record indicates that Defendant mailed the motion to Sprole that same day, *see* Docs. 21 at 2; 21-1 at 54; 21-2 at 8, and the Clerk mailed notice to Sprole the following day. *See* Doc. 22. Sprole's address, however, was not in the record, so, given Sprole's *pro se* status, the Court entered an Order on July 30, 2012 warning her of the consequences of failing to respond to Defendant's motion and granting her additional time to respond. *See* Doc. 23. Sprole still failed to respond. On August 30, 2012, the Court granted Defendant's motion for summary judgment. *See* Doc. 24.

Gorman complied with all requirements and duties when he withdrew as counsel; nothing more was required of him to protect Sprole's rights. Sprole's *pro se* status does not absolve her from compliance with the relevant rules of the Court. *See Moon v. Newsom*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989). The Court has already granted time extensions to Sprole in this matter, and the Court never indicated to her that it would give her additional time to find an attorney.

Accordingly, Sprole's motion to reconsider is ***DENIED***

This 13th day of September 2012.



B. AVANT EDENFIELD, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA